

LaRouchePAC Internationale Fredags-webcast, 19. februar 2016:

USA og Europa må samarbejde med Rusland og Kina for at undgå krig

Faren for en massiv, endnu større strøm af flygtninge, der kommer fra Afrika og ind i Europa, så vel som også den fortsatte krise centreret omkring Mellemøsten, betyder således, at Europa er absolut dømt til undergang, med mindre der finder et fundamentalt skifte i politikken sted. Og dette betyder, at USA og Europa indledningsvis må række hånden frem mod Rusland og Kina.

Engelsk Udskrift.

US & EUROPE MUST REACH OUT TO RUSSIA & CHINA TO AVOID WAR

International LaRouche PAC Webcast

Friday, February 19, 2016

MATTHEW OGDEN: Good evening. It's February 19, 2016. My name is Matthew Ogden and you're joining us for our weekly, Friday evening broadcast here from larouchepac .com

I'm joined in the studio tonight by Jason Ross from the LaRouche PAC science team, and we're joined via video, from a remote location, by Jeffrey Steinberg of Executive Intelligence

Review. The three of us, along with several others, had a chance

to have a discussion earlier today with both Lyndon and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, so what you're about to hear will be informed

by

that discussion.

Now, I'm going to just start right off the bat with a discussion of the very dire threat of an international conflict

arising, especially from the powderkeg of Syria, Northern Africa,

and the Middle East. The area of Syria, where, despite the efforts of Secretary John Kerry to find common ground with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, Obama's refusal to tell

Saudi Arabia and Turkey to stand down is threatening to blow this

entire thing sky high. A very accurate discussion of this was published earlier today in a piece on Consortium News by Robert

Parry, the editor of that publication, in which he says the risk

that the multi-sided Syrian war could spark World War III, continues, as Turkey and U.S. neo-cons seek an invasion that could kill Russian troops, and possibly escalate the Syrian crisis into a nuclear showdown.

What Robert Parry says in this article is that Barack Obama took questions from reporters on Tuesday, but he did not take the

one that needed to be asked: which was whether he had forbidden

Turkey and Saudi Arabia to invade Syria, because on that question

could hinge whether the ugly Syrian civil war could spin off into

World War III and possibly a nuclear showdown.

Now, this was part of our discussion earlier today with Mr. LaRouche and what I know Jeff will elaborate much more on, was LaRouche's analysis. But in short, what Mr. LaRouche had to say

is that what Putin is doing in this situation, and overall in

a
strategic manner, defines the point of action, defines the
point
of reference, for action. Everything else is bluff.
So, let me hand it over to Jeff, and he'll elaborate many
more of the details, and then we'll come back to our
institutional question for this evening, which Jeff will also
answer. So, Jeff?

JEFFREY STEINBERG: Thank you, Matt. Well, as we were going
through the discussion with Mr. LaRouche earlier today, he
actually drew a distinction between the bluff, and what he
said
much more accurately is the folly of what Turkey and Saudi
Arabia
are up to. It's folly because they are caught in their own
madness, and don't even realize the consequences of what
they're
doing in the real world. They don't have the capability to
carry
out the kind of provocations that they are threatening, and
the
danger, of course, is that that does not mean that they're not
going to try to do it.
Putin stepped into the Syria situation at a critical moment
last September, and the entire situation has shifted radically
since that point. The Russian intention is {not} to simply
accomplish a military victory on behalf of the forces of
President Assad. They're creating the conditions to force the
intransigents, in this case Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, some
of
the other Gulf states, and always lurking in the background
when
you're dealing with Saudi Arabia and the Muslim Brotherhood is
the British. So, Putin has established a clear sense of
control
over the situation. Undoubtedly part of Putin's configuration

is
that Obama has been greatly weakened by the actions of Russia;
on
the economic sphere, the actions of China; and there are sane
military forces in the United States who recognize the folly
of
what Turkey and Saudi Arabia are doing.

This has been described by Parry, whose article you
mentioned, and by others, as the danger of a Sarajevo 1914
flash
point, along the Syria-Turkey border, but what Mr. LaRouche
emphasized today is that Putin has a very clear sense of the
military correlation in this situation, and has also a very
clear

sense that Turkey and Saudi Arabia are acting on the basis of
their own irrationality. And he is luring them in to the kind
of

trap that could be basically enclosed on them at any moment.
It's

a gravely dangerous situation, but you have at least one key
player, namely Russian President Putin, who knows what he's
doing, and who is steering these events in a way that conforms
to

an appropriate strategic analysis, and to an understanding of
how

to basically defeat these forces that have been trying to
destroy

Syria for the last five years, and in so doing, to deprive
Russia

of one of its own critical access points in the Mediterranean
region.

Now, what Mr. LaRouche really emphasized, and I think that
this is the crucial point to take away from this issue, is
that

the center of gravity of world affairs has dramatically
shifted

to where the Asia-Eurasia region, anchored in the cooperation

between China and Russia and India, with other countries grouping around that, is really where the strategic center of the world economy has now been shifted. And if you look at the situation in Europe, in particular, from one end to the other you see nothing but bankruptcy and political failure. The United States is on the verge of the same kind of bankruptcy. And so the only place where you have growth and stability by any measure, and of course Asia and Russia and Eurasia are not devoid of problems, but relative to the state of absolute bankruptcy that we see in Europe and in the United States, we see a disintegration of the political and economic conditions in much of South America, as well. Of course, Africa has been on the target list of the British and other European colonial, imperial powers for the longest time. But in Asia, you not only have a much more stable and growing situation, but you have a commitment to an abandonment of geopolitics in favor of what Chinese President Xi Jinping has called the "win-win" strategy. And if you look at the crisis in Europe right now, leaving aside the fact that the entire European financial system is bankrupt – hopelessly, irreversibly bankrupt under the present conditions and terms of thinking that dominate Europe – if you look at the refugee crisis, you're beginning to

see a glimmer of sanity, driven by desperation, by certain of the people who are responsible for creating the European fiasco in the first place.

So, you've got people like Wolfgang Schäuble, the finance minister of Germany, who was one of the monsters behind the destruction of Europe, including the German economy itself, now saying there must be a Marshall Plan to rebuild Syria, to rebuild other parts of the Middle East, and only on the basis of a Marshall Plan, which gives people a clear incentive to go back to their homes, to rebuild their country, only under those circumstances, and those circumstances alone, can the refugee crisis in Europe be remotely solved. And of course, what applies to the Middle East applies doubly for Africa, where the U.S.-British-French overthrow of Qaddafi unleashed absolute hell throughout the African continent.

And so the danger of a massive, even larger flow of refugees coming out of Africa into Europe, as well as the continuing crisis centered in the Middle East, means that Europe is absolutely doomed unless there is a fundamental change in policy.

And for starters, that change means that the United States and Europe must reach out to Russia and China. You had the recent visit by President Xi Jinping of China to Saudi Arabia, to Iran, and to Egypt, and what Xi Jinping made very clear is that China is prepared to move towards the building of the Silk Road infrastructure, the New Silk Road land route, the Maritime Silk Route, which will come up through the newly expanded Suez Canal

– China will do that. In fact, just this week, the first freight train from Eastern China arrived in Iran, and this is part of the entire European system of not just transportation corridors, but development corridors that have been put forward by China as the cornerstone of their foreign policy.

So, they're presenting a win-win alternative. And in the case of Europe, there is no alternative. Europe is so politically and psychologically bankrupt – the leadership of Europe is so bankrupt that China, through this Middle East development portion

of the One Belt, One Road policy, offers the only viable basis for this Marshall Plan idea to actually be put into practice. And

were it not for the Putin intervention, beginning last September, we couldn't even be contemplating the possibility of that kind of solution to this seemingly intractable problem in the Middle East.

Now, Mr. LaRouche emphasized in this context that Europe is completely gone; it's completely bankrupt, and there are solutions, but the present leadership is unprepared to consider

that kind of level of rethinking. In the United States, we're very close to the edge, but the United States {can} be saved and

the solution to the problems in the United States begins with removing President Barack Obama from office immediately, and moving to wipe out the thoroughly bankrupt Wall Street system. Because until that system is put through basically a bankruptcy

shutdown, then none of the viable and available solutions are

going to be there. But, if you were to get rid of Obama, if you were to wipe out Wall Street,—and, for example, immediately passage of Glass-Steagall would be one critical element for that process to happen almost overnight – then we have a history in the United States. We had Alexander Hamilton. We had Franklin Roosevelt. We had glimmers of the same policy with John F. Kennedy. You go back to a credit system, a government credit system that kick-starts production, that trains a young generation that's right now completely unqualified to serve in a real economy.

All of that means the United States coming into alignment with what we see going on with China, with Russia, with India, with others. In other words, the United States becomes part of a genuine trans-Pacific collaboration, and under those circumstances, Europe itself would have no choice but to get on with the program.

So, what we're seeing from Turkey, from Saudi Arabia, and as I said, always watch for the British lurking in the background with those two countries – you have clinical insanity and folly, which holds the danger of war. But Mr. LaRouche again emphasized, Putin knows this. He sees all of this, and he is on top of the situation, and is prepared to take the appropriate and necessary actions. And there are some people who are not completely out of their minds on the U.S. side, within the military-intelligence community, who understand that partnering with Russia is the only way to solve this problem.

OGDEN: Thank you, Jeff. Now, just really on the subject that you ended on here, the bankruptcy of Wall Street and the extended

Wall Street system, and the relationship of that to the conditions in Europe; that brings us to our institutional question for this evening, which reads as follows: "Mr. LaRouche. The heat is turning up on British Prime Minister David

Cameron, who's trying to get the upper hand over a referendum that could result in the UK leaving the European Union. The potential break-up of the European Union, which is called 'Brexit', has elicited warnings about the impact on the UK economy should voters say that they want out of the EU. A recent

poll showed that 42% of UK voters would opt to leave the EU; compared to 38% who say that they would vote to stay. This week

will be the first major test as to whether Cameron's done enough

to secure an agreement to change some terms of the UK's relationship with the European bloc. Cameron says that he will campaign to stick with the EU, if a deal can be reached. This Thursday and Friday will be the first time that all 28 EU countries will discuss a package of proposals recently released

by the EU, aimed at addressing the UK's economic concerns. Cameron negotiated the proposals with the EU leaders and Donald

Tusk, President of the European Council – the EU's main decision-making body. What is your view of a possible 'Brexit'?"

STEINBERG: Well, you know, you've got "Brexit" that was preceded by "Grexit", and probably we're going to have a much larger lexicon; that all comes down to the fact that people have

the sense that the European Union, particularly the European

Monetary Union, is a sinking ship. And therefore, if the ship is sinking, or the movie theatre is on fire, you get to the exit as fast as possible. But the reality is, that the European Union – and within that, the European Monetary Union – are the problem. So, therefore, unless you address the more underlying issue, which is that Europe is financially and economically bankrupt; then it really is almost of secondary significance whether Britain stays in or leaves. If Britain leaves the European Union, then that's virtually it for the European Union. Other officials in Europe, even including Schäuble at the Davos Conference earlier this month, said that if the Schengen agreement, the open borders agreement in Europe is broken, then the European Union will cease to exist. And already in Poland, in Hungary, in other countries on the edge of Europe but within the European Union, they're already building those walls. So in effect, the European Union, as it's presently constituted, is a dead letter; it really doesn't exist. And the countries of Europe, either collectively or individually, are going to have to come to face the reality that their banking system is thoroughly bankrupt; they've lost so much productive capacity that Europe from a physical standpoint is no longer capable of self-reliance, self-preservation. So, the whole thing is going under; and of course, there's a certain irony in the British threatening to leave the European Union,

since the bankruptcy of the entire trans-Atlantic system is largely the result of policies that were created in London, and were then spread about Europe and the United States. You could almost say that Europe was doomed from the moment that Margaret Thatcher launched the Big Bang in 1985, and turned London into a safe haven for speculative gambling operations, drug-money laundering, anything other than investment in the real economy. So now, we're 30 years into that process, and Europe is finished. So, the issues that are being negotiated between Cameron and Tusk and the others on the European Commission, are tiddlywinks; they're not the real issues. Unless Europe comes up with its own version of shutting down the City of London and Wall Street, a genuine full-scale Glass-Steagall separation of legitimate commercial banking activity from all of the gambling, then Europe is completely doomed. And the only hope that they will have is that some sane future leaders, who emerge out of this political rubble, recognize before it's perhaps too late that aligning with China and Russia – which is exactly the opposite of the policies that are being pursued in Europe right now – is the only answer. So, I think that that's the context in which the question can be answered; and so the issue is merely that Europe in its present circumstance is doomed. And whether Britain leaves the European Union or stays in, they are part of that system of doom that's going to have to be changed in a much more fundamental – I'd say "revolutionary" – way. And the

opportunities are there; they're presented there because Europe is at the western end of Eurasia; and the Chinese have already established the rail links between central China and Germany. There are opportunities galore under the umbrella of the "One Belt-One Road" policy; but the first step is that the European leaders are going to have to abandon their folly. And that's a difficult proposition to conceive of, given who the current European leadership is.

OGDEN: Absolutely. And, let me just elaborate a little bit what Mrs. Helga Zepp-LaRouche emphasized, which is that if you just look at the refugee crisis, for example, and the absolute breakdown of Europe to even absorb and handle this under the current economic conditions. This has pushed people to begin to discuss the possibility of what the LaRouche movement has been advocating for quite a long time; which is a new Marshall Plan, a new program of economic development for the Middle East and North Africa. It is what was published by the Schiller Institute and {Executive Intelligence Review} in a major book-length publication a number of years back, called "A New Marshall Plan for Southern Europe and the Mediterranean". What Helga LaRouche emphasized is that at the point that the EU is really detonating underneath people's noses, there is no solution within the current geometry. The only solution is to go with this kind of Marshall Plan, and to work with China and the BRICS and other countries, to extend the Silk Road project into this region and to develop the Middle East and North Africa in order to have an incentive for millions and tens of millions of refugees not to leave to seek

a
better condition. And Helga LaRouche's emphasis was that this
is
a very substantial example of what Xi Jinping has called the
"win-win" paradigm; the "win-win" system. It is a win for
everybody, for Europe and the United States to work with China
and Russia to develop the Middle East and North Africa along
the
Silk Road routes. This kind of cooperation between China and
the
rest of the world is what China is seeking in inviting the
rest
of the world to engage in; and this is the only way to solve
the
crises and shift the geometry overall which is creating the
existential threat which is now being faced by Europe.
Now, this new paradigm; this is exactly what we have been
talking about for quite a while, but I think the foundation
for a
new paradigm cannot be seen as merely some sort of extension
of
former or present geopolitical ideas about how the world
works.
This is not merely a rearrangement of political and economic
and
strategic alliances between countries that would still be
dominated by the same axiomatic world view which is what has
brought us to this crisis point to begin with. Rather, there
needs to be a true renaissance; a new calibration, a
re-examination of what our view of mankind is. What our view
of
man as a species is, and what mankind's role within this
galaxy
and his relationship to the entire universe; and indeed, what
his
responsibility is as a uniquely creative species in this
universe

must be.

So, on that subject, Jason Ross is joining us from the LaRouche PAC Science Team, and I think we're going to have a somewhat exciting discussion of what are the implications of the really profound work that Albert Einstein engaged in over a century ago; and which is now grabbing the headlines again in the form of this experiment that has revealed the affirmation of Einstein's hypothesis concerning the shape of space-time.

JASON ROSS: Thanks. As I imagine everyone has heard by now, on September 14th of last year, a gravitational wave was detected by the interferometer experiments that we had set up in Washington state and in Louisiana. Over a few months, that signal was studied to make sure that that really was what had occurred; and a paper was submitted in January and published in February announcing the news that a gravitational wave phenomenon representing the merging of two black holes had been detected. This meant that a change in space-time had been experienced in that detector; where maybe we don't know how the experiment worked.

Very briefly, two tracks at right angles to each other, allowed light to move up and down those tracks. Those tracks reach 4 kilometers long. Due to some very clever engineering, the effect of length was 100 times that; and by the motion of these gravity waves – meaning a change in the shape of space due to a varying intensity of gravity due to these two black holes spinning around each other – the length of the two tracks varied by an amount that was about 1/10 the diameter of a proton over

a track length of 4 kilometers. This is equivalent to the star nearest to us getting closer and further away by the width of a hair. It's amazing that was actually able to be measured; that's an astonishingly tiny change.

And it says something about the difficulties and why it's been – as Matt said – it's been a century since Einstein had proposed the existence of these gravity waves; and now they've been detected. So, the recent upgrades to these detectors here in the US made this possible; there are other detectors around the world. Some of them are being upgraded; new ones are being brought on line. There is a proposal for a space-based interferometry experiment – the Lisa experiment; which NASA had been a part of, and has now left it to the European Space Agency, currently scheduled to launch in 2034. Perhaps it'll be sent sooner than that, based on this news.

But what does all of this mean? What does it tell us about – what are the implications? Well for one thing, this means we really have an entirely new tool for looking at the universe that we live in. All of our knowledge about the heavens beyond us, comes from sight, or various forms of sight. You can't smell a star, you can't taste it; you can't hear it, you can't feel it.

You can see it. So various forms of seeing are the way we learn more about our surroundings. From simple observations with the eyes here on Earth, which were all that were available to Kepler when he determined how the planets moved; the use of telescopes

in the optical range – simple telescopes that could be seen with the eye – into more complex telescopes, including ones that see what we wouldn't typically call light; radio telescopes. Telescopes in Earth orbit, looking in other wavelengths of the electromagnetic spectrum; infrared telescopes, ultra-violet telescopes, x-ray telescopes. We've got a lot of ways of

side of the Moon, where China is going to be within just a few years sending a lander. The potential to do long wavelength radio telescope work from that location; this represents something new.

But what we've got with this successful detection based on the change in space-time with the LIGO [Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory] experiments, this is something totally different. This is like bringing in a new sense all together. We've been seeing the universe; now we can probably hear it would be the best analogy. It represents a vibration, like the sound vibrations our ears are able to pick up. Only this time, it's incredibly faint, and it's about space itself vibrating; that really is what it is. So, that's tremendously important.

On the history of this, it's important to keep in mind people are very excited about this; there's good reason to be, it's quite a development. But this can only indirectly be called a scientific breakthrough; the science behind this – Einstein proposed this in 1916. He had some more thoughts and wrote another paper in 1918; some more discussion about it. Hypotheses about black holes, breakthroughs in computing ability to try to model these types of things; all of that took place. But what

could be called the fundamentally scientific change occurred
100

years ago with Einstein's theory of relativity; with gravity waves being one of the implications. Being able to detect them is

wonderful; it's an amazing technological advancement. It shows that we are capable of precision that was totally undreamed of in

Einstein's time, certainly, or even a few decades ago. The development that we've made has been tremendous.

But I think it's fair to say this was not a scientific breakthrough in the real sense of science. It is a new sensation;

it is a new technology. It is a whole new way of looking at things; and that is tremendously important. I think that if we look back at what Einstein did that made his hypothesis possible,

we can compare it to the really awful influence of Bertrand Russell.

So, first on Einstein. We've got to recall that what Einstein did in laying out his revolutionary theories was not something that he derived; it wasn't something that he proved. It

wasn't something that he showed was true based on what was already known. What Einstein said about the universe contradicted

the Newtonian view of space and time that had become dominant. Einstein said that that simplistic view of space and time, which

went along somewhat intuitively with our senses, was in fact untrue; and that basic concepts like simultaneity, or knowing that two events happen at the same time, such a basic concept as

that. That there's one time that applies everywhere; Einstein showed that was untrue. That's a very unintuitive thought. The idea that space could have a shape to it; that's a very unintuitive thought. It's not suggested by appearances.

But what Einstein was doing was implementing a world outlook that goes back to Cusa – although I'm not going to talk about him right now – but to Leibniz and to Bernhard Riemann. If we consider the work of Leibniz, 1646-1716, the founder of physical economy; there's plenty to say about him, and plenty will be said on this website. One of the specific things that he looked at was in the world of physics, Leibniz's demonstration that there was no absolute space; that there was no absolute time. This was contrary to Descartes, Newton, and others. Leibniz said there's no distinction between rest and motion, for example. If there's no absolute space, you can't say that anything is at absolute rest; that was a concept used by Descartes. Absolute space was a concept used by Newton. But Leibniz was in a fight about this, saying that space was a relation between concurrently existing things; but it didn't exist on its own. In a debate that he had with a top Newtonian – Samuel Clarke – this seemingly physical discrepancy about is space absolute or not, turned into very directly a political one. That, both of these two – Leibniz and Clarke – used their concept of space to make a point about God, and implicitly also about government; about the basis of the legitimacy of a ruler. Clarke, the Newtonian, said that because everything could have been created anywhere in space once God decided to do the Creation, that showed that God made a choice without any necessity; that it was just because God felt like doing then and felt like doing it where he did, because he felt like doing

that.

Sort of like a dog deciding to his business wherever he feels like it. Leibniz said that if God had to do something without a

good reason, that God would be only all-powerful, but not good or

wise. And Leibniz said that that conception of God has to include

those perfections as well; goodness, wisdom, and power.

Now between the lines, what these two were also saying was a view of government and a view of society. Implicit in this is Leibniz's view that the legitimacy of a ruler or of government is

not simply from having gathered power; but from using it in a wise way to achieve good ends. That may seem a little bit far afield, but it's true; and this is part of the background on this

concept. That from the necessity for goodness came the nonexistence of absolute space; that's how Leibniz showed that.

He was right.

Bernhard Riemann, in 1854, delivered a presentation, wrote a paper on the shape of space. And Riemann said that since the time

of Euclid up to his time, no one had ever really taken on in a realistic way, what the basis of the shape of space is. That Euclid said things like the sum of the angles in a triangle are

180; Riemann said that may or may not be true. On a curved space,

for example, it's not true. The most important aspect is that Riemann didn't propose replacing Euclid with a similar geometry;

it's that he said that the basis of our understanding of space has to be the physical causes that make things occur within space. He was right; that was Einstein's approach. With relativity, he said that our understanding of space can't

start

from a box; it has to start from physical principles that give rise to the effects in space, and to the relationship of objects

in space. So light, gravitation, these became the basis of space

for Einstein; and those concepts lie outside of space. They aren't geometrical concepts in the way Euclid's concepts were geometrical. Light is a real thing; gravity is a real principle.

So, Einstein, in following on this and implementing it, and developing his theories, developing his breakthroughs of relativity, created something that contradicted; he made a new hypothesis. To contrast that, let's look at the past 100 years.

We've now affirmed something that Einstein had proposed 100 years

ago; but where are the new Einsteins? Where are the new theories

that contradict? Where are the new concepts that don't follow from what we already know, but introduce fundamentally new principles? And more importantly, why is that not understood as

what science really is?

To say just a little bit about Bertrand Russell's role in all of that, LaRouche has called Russell the most evil man of the

20th Century; and we have given ample demonstrations of that. Some of the more straightforward evidence of it is his views about keeping the world population down; especially dark-skinned

racess, who Russell particularly was upset about there being more

of. Proposing a scientific dictatorship, using murder to eliminate people who became intelligent and opposed the ruling class, keeping science secret from the majority of people; this

is some of the nice outlook that Russell had on things. He also, in his own work as a "professional" you might say, worked on destroying the concept of science and turning it into mathematics. He did this before and after the year 1900; this is somewhat earlier in his life, where he wanted to throw away what Einstein ended up doing, which was creating a new concept that contradicted the past. And say instead, that every thought in the future, will have to derive from thoughts in the past; that we can replace creativity with logic. Russell really put that into practice. Many people who are familiar with Russell might think of him as being an anti-war demonstrator, as being a peace-loving activist. Somebody who was opposed to war, to conflict; especially to nuclear weapons. And, included in that, technology itself; the concept that science is dangerous, that perhaps science should be held back, because these technologies allow us to exterminate ourselves. The idea that the appropriate response to that would be to eliminate technologies, rather than to have a productive, future-oriented basis for relations among nations. This really sprung up in a major way around anti-nuclear activism, of which Russell was a major proponent. So, I think what we can reflect on, what we can take from the excitement around these gravitational findings, is that: 1) it's an opportunity to really go back and really develop and understanding of who Einstein was. How did he think? Who was this man, who a century ago, put forth the hypothesis that was detected in this way only this year. Who was Riemann? How did

he
actually think? We can reflect on the opportunities that we
have
for the use of these kinds of instruments to provide us an
entirely new window to understanding the universe around us.
Not
only are we seeing things in a different band, we're using a
different sense all together. We're hearing the universe;
we're
able to listen in on a completely different kind of physical
process than the electromagnetic ones that are the basis of
all
astronomy otherwise. Using light, radio waves, x-rays and that
sort of thing. And I think it also demonstrates that the
ability
to develop new technologies, to rise to a challenge, certainly
exists. And we saw this in the Apollo program, which
similarly,
going to the Moon itself did not involve as much new science
as
it did new technologies, new social organizations to implement
those technologies. Which we saw with some of the
breakthroughs
of the truly amazing apparatus used to detect these
gravitational
waves. But we have to have grand objectives. I mentioned the
LISA
experiment; a space-based interferometry experiment, similar
to
ones which did this recent detection, which NASA had been a
major
player in and then pulled back on, as part of the Obama
destruction of a national mission, a natural future. NASA, as
the
leading representative of that future orientation of the
nation.
So, we have to have human objectives for the nation, for

ourselves. We have to, as a nation, have objectives like what China's doing now; as represented by China's moves towards the Moon from the Helium-3 standpoint. From the sheer excitement of the population of China being asked to put forward proposals for experiments to take up to the Moon. This is something that people are actually thinking about as citizens of this nation. "Wow! What are we going to send up there?" "What are we going to take to the Moon for the next trip?" We've got a lot of objectives that have been defined that we have just been sitting on for decades. And if we eliminate the source of this culturally, the frankly unscientific view of science, this anti-human view of humanity, we can do great things. And we can do it by removing Obama and giving this nation a future-oriented mission again.

OGDEN: Well thank you very much, Jason. I think that's certainly exciting; the idea to be able to directly perceive changes in space-time itself. So, I'd like to thank Jason for his presentation, and I'd like to thank Jeff for joining us remotely today. And I'd like to thank all of you for joining us; and please stay tuned to larouchepac.com. Good night.